

City of Taylorsville
Planning Commission Work Session
Minutes
Tuesday – September 27, 2005– 6:30 P.M.
2600 West Taylorsville Blvd – Council Chambers

Attendance:

Planning Commission

Kristie Overson, Chair
Ted Jensen
Scott Bolton
Robert B. Daniels
Blaine Smith
Joan Rushton-Carlson

Excused: Dama Barbour
Angelo Calacino

Community Development Staff

Mark McGrath, Director
Michael Maloy, City Planner
Nick Norris, City Planner
Dan Udall, City Planner
Jean Gallegos, Admin Assistant/Recorder

PUBLIC : Margaret Player, Keith Player, Jack Lucas, Chet Nichols

[18:33:19](#)

WELCOME: **Commissioner Overson** welcomed those present, explained the procedures to be followed this evening, and opened the meeting at 6:30 p.m.

GENERAL PLAN AMENDMENT

- | | | |
|----|------|--|
| 1. | 9G05 | <u>Jack Lucas, 1590-1632 West 6235 South.</u> Recommendation to the City Council to Amend the General Plan Map from Mixed Use to Medium Density Residential. (Michael Maloy/City Planner) |
|----|------|--|

[18:34:27](#)

1.1 **Mr. Maloy** oriented on the site plan, aerial map and images. Mr. Jack Lucas is requesting a General Plan Map Amendment for approximately 1.61 acres of property. The request is to amend the existing General Plan Map for the property from Mixed Use to medium Density Residential, which is 8.9 dwelling units per acre maximum. The property has recently been the focus of public hearings held by the Planning Commission. Previously, the applicant successfully petitioned the City to amend the zoning Map from A-1 to MD-3 for a portion of the property for a possible mixed use development. Following approval by the City Council, the applicant determined that the “highest and best use” for the property would not be mixed use but rather medium density residential. **Based on previous public hearing held before the Planning Commission and City Council, and based on the traffic estimate figures provided by the Institute of Transportation Engineers, Staff recommends approval.**

1.2 **APPLICANT ADDRESS:** **Jack Lucas.** [18:37:10](#) **Mr. Lucas** commented that he appreciated Staff’s presentation and felt strongly that medium density would be the best transitional use for this property. The proposal is for higher end town homes which he felt there was a need for in this community. He added that the traffic impact would be less with this development than it would with an office or professional office and the amount of green space would be three times as great. He has been contacting people in the neighborhood and has a petition signed by 15 individuals who are supportive of the medium density use and who do not want further commercial encroachment into their neighborhood.

1.3 **SPEAKING:**

1. **Margaret Player.** [18:42:53](#) **Mrs. Player** said she was not completely in opposition to this project but felt there were problems. She noted that the petition Mr. Lucas eluded to did not contain signatures from people who reside on 6235 South. Those signing the petition live mostly where there is not a lot of traffic and have no idea what the traffic impact would be to add 14 units in that area. She was happy to hear the homes will be constructed of stucco and brick, with additional green space, however, that each unit would have at least two cars and generate a lot more traffic. She suggested that instead of doing a medium density residential that her neighborhood would prefer single family homes or at least a lesser number of town homes in there and no more commercial.

2. **Randy Black** (Lives north of the development). **Mr. Black's** concerns also involved the increase in traffic with the addition of 14 more homes. He felt the impact would be worse during the commuting hours in the morning and evening. He too, preferred single family residential and felt medium density was too intense. He asked that the number of proposed units be reduced.
3. **Chet Nichols** - [18:50:05](#). **Mr. Nichols** wanted to correct a point made by Mrs. Player when she said there were no neighbors on the petition who live on her street by saying that two of the land owners have property that borders directly on 6235 South.

1.4 **DISCUSSION OR A MOTION:** [18:51:13](#) **Commissioner Overson** commented that any project going in on this particular parcel would impact the traffic problems and felt that the density was a big issue. [18:51:56](#). **Mr. Maloy** added that while the proposed development may not be staff's preferred option, it was felt to be marketable as presented. [18:53:36](#) **Commissioner Smith** agreed that anything going in on the site would impact the traffic problems for 6235 South. [18:53:55](#) **Commissioner Daniels** felt like there were worse uses for that property than this developer is proposing and that adverse factors would be minimal and hoped that a majority of the neighbors would be supportive.

- 1.5 **MOTION:** [Commissioner Daniels 18:54:52](#) - I would like to recommend approval of this amendment to the General Plan map, Application # 9G05.
SECOND: [Commissioner Bolton 18:55:07](#)
Commissioner Overson - We have a motion by Commissioner Daniels to approve Agenda Item #1, File 9G05, changing the General Plan map amending it from mixed use to medium density with a second by Commissioner Bolton.
VOTE: All Commissioners voted in favor. Motion passes unanimously. [18:55:37](#)

ZONING TEXT CHANGE

2. 17Z05 **City of Taylorsville** – Family Center at Midvalley (DDR) – Amendment of Chapter 13.48, Signs and Zoning Map. (Michael Maloy/City Planner)

[18:56:54](#)

2.1 **Mr. Maloy** explained the purpose for the sign amendment is facilitate reconstruction of pylon signs along Redwood Road and 5400 South within the Family Center by Developer's Diversified Realty (DDR), owners of the regional shopping center. He showed detailed elevations of proposed pylon signs along with the corresponding site plan. This sign plan represents many months of coordinated effort between the Economic Development Director and representatives of DDR. Staff feels that this shopping center warrants unique sign regulations and is in need of reinvestment in order to compete with other regional shopping centers in the Salt Lake Valley. Redevelopment of the outdated pylon signs while improving visibility from I-215 is a critical component of redevelopment goals for DDR as well as the City. **Staff recommends approval of the proposed Zoning Ordinance amendment provided below based on the findings presented this evening.**

ZONE	SIGN	SIZE	HEIGHT	LOCATION	OTHER
C-2 – Redwood Rd/I-215 Overlay Zone	Ground Sign	A regional shopping center consisting of at least 50 acres with common ownership: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 310 square feet maximum. 425 square feet maximum for a sign located within 600 feet of the main traveled way of I-215. 600 square feet maximum for a sign located at the intersection of two public streets (excluding I-215). 	35 feet maximum. 50 feet maximum for sign abutting Redwood Road and within 600 feet of the main traveled way of I-215. 70 foot maximum for signs abutting I-215 frontage but not within 500	C-2 zone, 18 inch setback; C-3 zone, no setback. One sign per 300 feet of frontage or part thereof.	Illumination may be built into or attached to signs. Electronic message center signs are a conditional use.

			feet of Redwood Road.		
--	--	--	-----------------------	--	--

2.2 **SPEAKING:** None.

2.3 **MOTION:** [19:02:01 Commissioner Rushton-Carlson](#) – In accordance with Staff's recommendation and analysis, I move for approval of a positive recommendation to the City Council for Application 17Z05.
SECOND: [Commissioner Daniels](#)
[Commissioner Overson](#) - The motion by Commissioner Rushton-Carlson is to approve a positive recommendation to the City Council regarding an amendment to the Taylorsville Zoning Ordinance concerning Chapter 13.48 Signs, File 17Z05 and a second by Commissioner Daniels.
VOTE: All Commissioners voted in favor. Motion passes unanimously.

CONDITIONAL USES

3. 28C05 <u>Nathan Coulter, 2162 W. 5400 S.</u> - Conditional Use Amendment to Site plan. (Nick Norris/City Planner)
--

[19:03:49](#)

3.1 **Mr. Norris** advised that Nathan Coulter has made a request to discuss one of the conditions of approval for his car wash at 2162 W. 5400 South. Specifically, the applicant would like to discuss the condition requiring a 2 foot high wall in the front yard landscaping. During the preliminary approval hearing, the Planning Commission added that condition, the purpose for which being to screen the vacuum stations and the drive aisle. The wall was to be constructed of the same stacked stone material that was shown on the main building. The applicant has asked staff if a landscaping berm of equal height would serve that purpose. He has also asked to amend the 20' setback to the north to be 15'. Staff informed the applicant that only the Planning Commission can make that modification. This is on the agenda tonight for discussion purposes only. The Planning Commission will grant final approval on this project, so any modification to the site plan could be approved during the public hearing for the final approval.

3.2 **APPLICANT ADDRESS:** [Nathan Coulter 19:12:02](#) **Mr. Coulter** advised more commercial developments are using landscaped berms than walls now and showed the Commission a rendering of a similar structure with the type of proposed berm. He advised that the request to change the landscaping setbacks along the north boundary was at the request of the property owner to the west, Mr. Rick Brunson. [19:16:17 Commissioner Jensen](#) wanted to know the height of the proposed berm and Mr. Coulter advised it would be at least 30" and would include a combination of trees and bushes. **Commissioner Rushton-Carlson** expressed concern with reducing the north boundary setback as requested due to the intensity of this proposed use. [19:19:30 Commissioner Daniels](#) said he was more concerned with the berm and would like it a minimum of 36".

3.3 **SPEAKING:** [Rick Brunson 19:20:07](#) (Owns the property to the west). **Mr. Brunson** felt that the wall along the north side would create a substantial buffer and that the distance of the landscaping would not affect that. His concern was taking five extra feet off his property and asked that be reduced. [19:22:15 Mr. Coulter](#) added that if the landscape requirement were reduced to 15' it would still meet the 15% requirement for the site.

3.4 **DISCUSSION:**

1. [19:23:00 Commissioner Bolten](#) asked if staff is looking at this site as one piece of property with both buildings or are they separated for landscape requirements. [19:23:19 Mr. Norris](#) advised that the landscape requirement is separated and the only reason staff is looking at the corner piece is due to a proposed cross access agreement. In that way it is part of this development
2. [19:23:56 Commissioner Jensen](#) felt the main factor to mitigate the sound is the landscaping and that there would be enough to do that within the 15' requested. [19:24:18](#) The applicant has already agreed to add a 30" berm in front, which would go a long ways in reducing the noise from 5400 South. That there would be more noise coming from the highway than the car wash would generate and with this proposal, both owners will get what they need to make their property profitable.

3. [19:25:58](#) **Commissioner Rushton-Carlson** wanted to know if the neighbors were noticed about this proposed site plan change and **Mr. McGrath** said that the issue of the berm did not impact the neighborhood, therefore, they were not noticed. If the Commission feels that is necessary, staff will do so. [19:26:29](#) **Commissioner Jensen** advised that the Commission can address that issue with adequate noticing for the final approval hearing.
- 3.4 **MOTION:** [19:28:26](#) **Commissioner Jensen** - I would like to make a motion to amend prior Item 28C05 to include a 30" high berm along the front in place of the wall there and based on the fact that sound mitigation is basically due to landscaping rather than width, I would like to recommend that the setback on the north side be 15' rather than 20', recognizing the fact that the Commission will see this again at final approval.
- SECOND:** **Commissioner Smith.**
- Commissioner Overson** - We have a motion by Commissioner Jensen to amend this Conditional Use to include a 30" high berm along the 5400 South edge of the property and a 15' landscape setback along the north edge of the property, and a second by Commissioner Smith.
- VOTE:** [19:30:30](#)
- | | |
|--|--|
| Commissioner Daniels – NAY | Commissioner Smith – AYE |
| Commissioner Jensen – AYE | Commissioner Bolton – AYE |
| Commissioner Rushton-Carlson – AYE | Commissioner Overson – NAY |
- Motion passes 4 to 2
- DISCUSSION:** **Explanation of vote.** **Commissioner Overson** advised her NAY vote was due to the fact that she would have liked to have seen the landscape along the back wall remain at 20'. **Commissioner Daniels** said that was part of his reason for the NAY vote. Also that he would like to encourage the applicant to entertain the thought of adding additional vegetation to the front berm to bring it above 36".

<p>4. 25C05 <u>Jack Lucas, 1276 and 1286 W. Winchester Street, 6615 and 6647 South 1300 West.</u> (Michael Maloy/City Planner)</p>

[19:31:12](#)

4.1 **Mr. Maloy** advised that on August 23, 2005, the Taylorsville Planning Commission voted 6-0 to grant preliminary approval of a conditional use permit for Jack Lucas to construct a residential PUD. Following the public hearing, the applicant considered certain conditions of approval too onerous or unnecessary. Pursuant to City Code 13.50.120, Appeal of Planning Commission Decision, Mr. Lucas filed a letter of appeal to the Taylorsville City Council requesting amendment of certain conditions of approval. The City Council has reviewed the applicant's petition and has set a hearing date on the appeal for October 12, 2005. Following the Council's decision, the applicant submitted to the City a reviewed preliminary site plan that provides a common "green space" in the interior of the project, which is in compliance with Condition #15 of preliminary approval. However, the site plan does not comply with the required rear yard setbacks specified in Condition #13 of preliminary approval. In an attempt to resolve the appeal without further intervention from the City Council, the applicant requests:

- Condition #13 be modified to reflect the proposed setbacks of the preliminary plan; (Change from 20' to 15').
- Preliminary approval of the amended site plan relative to the location and size of the proposed open space, which is in response to Condition #15 of preliminary approval.
- If approved, the applicant has committed to withdraw his letter of appeal to the City Council.

4.2 **APPLICANT ADDRESS:** **Jack Lucas.** [19:40:33.](#) **Mr. Lucas** advised that their project will have close to 4,000 sq ft common area, including the retention pond area. Many units are further than 15' already but to require all lots to have a 20' setback would ruin the curvature of the street, etc.

4.3 **SPEAKING:** None.

4.4 **CLOSED FOR DISCUSISON/MOTION:**

4.5 **MOTION:** **Commissioner Daniels** - I would like to commend the applicant for the difficult work he has done to come closer to what the Commission and the City of Taylorsville might find to be a more than adequate development. I think it looks great and with some slight changes it will be a model area. [19:44:36](#) I will make a motion to move to grant concessions that are requested here tonight.

SECOND: Commissioner Rushton-Carlson

Commissioner Overson - 19:45:39 We have a motion by Commissioner Daniels to modify the site plan for Item 25C05 to include amending Item #13 to read "15 feet" as a rear yard setback and based on the site plan that we are seeing tonight, Item #15 is okay. There is a second by Commissioner Rushton-Carlson.

VOTE: All Commissioners voted in favor. Motion passes unanimously.

WORK SESSION

5. **Discussion of Future Planning Commission Business – 19:49:59** **Commissioner Jensen** submitted a list of 25 items which he would like discussed during subsequent work sessions by the Planning Commission at some point in time. During the meeting this evening, he briefly reviewed the items he considered as the most important and staff will add them a few at a time to subsequent work session meetings.

ADJOURNMENT: 20:27:55 By motion of **Commissioner Daniels** and second by **Commissioner Smith**, the meeting was adjourned at 8:28 p.m.

Respectfully submitted by:

Jean Gallegos, Administrative Assistant to the
Planning Commission

Approved in meeting held on November 8, 2005.